

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were originally filed in the present application.

Claims 1-16 have been rejected.

Claim 1, 8 and 15 have been amended.

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims.

In Section 2 of the December 15, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner reminded the Applicant of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. In response, the Applicant has removed the words "There is disclosed" from the Abstract. Furthermore, the length of the Abstract is less than 150 words. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Abstract of the Disclosure now employs proper language and is in a proper format.

In Sections 3 and 4 of the December 15, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,286,001 to *Walker, et al.* (hereinafter, simply "*Walker*"). In sections 5 and 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 6 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walker* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,466,937 to *Fascenda* (hereinafter, simply "*Fascenda*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to Claim 1, which contains the unique and non-obvious limitations emphasized below:

1. A wireless communication device comprising:
a main controller capable of executing a basic operating system application program that operates communication functions of said wireless communication device and that controls a first graphical user interface (GUI) for interacting with a user; and

a memory coupled to said main controller capable of storing a first GUI configuration file and a second GUI configuration file, wherein said first GUI configuration file contains first GUI parameter data comprising a first plurality of text names and a corresponding plurality of data comprising at least one of: sounds, graphical images, text, menu options and a menu hierarchy associated with said first graphical user interface, and said second GUI configuration file contains second GUI parameter data comprising a second plurality of text names and a corresponding plurality of data comprising at least one of: sounds, graphical images, text, menu options and a menu hierarchy associated with a second graphical user interface, and wherein said main controller is operable to validate said second GUI parameter data by comparing a first text name checksum value contained in said first GUI configuration file with a second text name checksum value contained in said second GUI configuration file. (*emphasis added*)

The Applicant respectfully asserts that the above-emphasized limitations are not disclosed, suggested, or even hinted at in the *Walker* reference, the *Fascenda* reference, or the combination of the *Walker* reference and the *Fascenda* reference.

In rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner cited column 13, lines 7-10 of the *Walker* reference. The Examiner asserted that the authorized list of the *Walker* reference teaches a first GUI configuration file containing first GUI parameter data comprising a first plurality of text names associated with at least one of: sounds, graphical images, text, menu options and a menu hierarchy. The Examiner further asserted that the *Walker* reference describes a main controller of a wireless communication device that validates second GUI parameter data by comparing a text name checksum associated with the second data with a text name checksum associated with first GUI parameter data.

The *Walker* reference describes a Web browser that generates checksums on text data contained in web pages of authorized Web sites. *See Walker, Abstract*. The checksums are stored in an “authorized URL list,” containing a home page URL (or Internet address), sub-page URLs, and

checksums generated from the text of the home page and sub-pages. *See Walker, col. 10, lines 37-52.* When the authorized Web sites are again accessed, the browser generates checksums on text data contained in the subsequently accessed web pages and compares these checksums with the stored checksums to determine whether any data in the web pages have changed. *See Walker, Abstract; col. 13, lines 7-10.* Thus, the “authorized URL list” of the *Walker* reference contains only the URLs and checksums of the authorized web pages; it does not contain the actual text and graphics of the pages. Furthermore, the subsequently accessed web page is validated by comparing a checksum from the authorized URL list to a checksum freshly prepared by the browser from the received web page data, not to a checksum contained in the web page.

The Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the Applicants’ invention. As amended, independent Claim 1 recites a first GUI configuration file comprising text names and corresponding data, including at least one of sounds, graphical images, text menu options and a menu hierarchy. Additionally, amended independent Claim 1 recites a main controller operable to compare a checksum contained in a first GUI configuration file with a checksum contained in a second GUI configuration file. The Applicant respectfully submits that the *Walker* reference does not describe a wireless communication device as recited in amended independent Claim 1. The Applicant further submits that the *Fascenda* reference does nothing to overcome the shortcomings of the *Walker* reference.

As such, independent Claim 1 contains patentable subject matter over the *Walker* reference and the *Fascenda* reference. Also, dependent Claims 2-7 depend from Claim 1 and contain all of the

unique and non-obvious limitations recited in Claim 1. Thus, Claims 2-7 also are patentable over the cited prior art references.

Amended independent Claims 8 and 15 contains limitations that are analogous to the unique and non-obvious limitations recited in independent Claim 1. This being the case, Claims 8 and 15 are patentable over the *Walker* reference and the *Fascenda* reference. Furthermore, dependent Claims 9-14, which depend from Claim 8, and Claim 16, which depends from Claim 15, contain all of the unique and non-obvious limitations recited in their respective base claims. Thus, dependent Claims 9-14 and 16 also are patentable over the cited prior art references.

SUMMARY

For the reasons given above, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of pending claims and that this Application be passed to issue. If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this Application, the Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *jmockler@davismunck.com*.


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: 1 March 2005

P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
Phone: (972) 628-3600
Fax: (972) 628-3616
E-mail: *jmockler@davismunck.com*



John T. Mockler
Registration No. 39,775